



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

685. A corporation is an entirety, irrespective of the persons who own all of its stock, and the fact that one person owns all the stock does not make him and the corporation one and the same person. *Ulmer v. Lime Rock R. Co.*, 98 Me. 579, 57 Atl. 1001, 1007, 66 L. R. A. 387.

CORPORATIONS—TRANSFER OF SHARES—BONA FIDE PURCHASERS—ESTOPPEL.—Plaintiffs purchased certain stock certificates, believing the stock to have been fully paid, said certificates not showing upon their faces upon what terms they were issued, and now seek to enjoin the sale of the stock for a delinquent assessment on the unpaid subscriptions. *Held*, that a corporation is not required to have the certificate show the terms on which it was issued, and purchasers of shares have no right to assume that the stock is fully paid, and no estoppel by representation can be invoked against the corporation. *O'Dea et al. v. Hollywood Cemetery Ass'n, et al.* (1908), — Cal. —, 97 Pac. 1.

The above decision is not in harmony with the weight of authority upon this point. After stating that a purchaser of stock is entitled to rely on statements in the corporate books that stock is fully paid up, COOK, CORPORATIONS, § 50, says, "the law goes still further and holds that where a person in open market, in good faith and without notice, purchases certificates, such stock is to be deemed 'paid up' in his hands, and he is protected as a *bona fide* purchaser, even though there is nothing on the face of the certificates stating that they are paid up. *Johnson v. Lullman*, 15 Mo. App. 55." To the same effect CLARK AND MARSHALL, CORPORATIONS, § 564f. A party purchasing a certificate of stock which does not state whether it is paid up or not may assume that it is paid up, and will be protected in that assumption. *DuPont v. Tilden*, 42 Fed. 87. Since a corporation can readily guard itself as well as the purchaser by expressing on the face of such shares as are not paid up the fact that they are subject to call for unpaid subscription price, and in view of the important character assumed by shares of stock in both speculative and investment markets, a *bona fide* purchaser, for value and without notice that the subscription price is unpaid, should be protected as between himself and the corporation. *West Nashville Planing Mill Co. v. Nashville Savings Bank*, 86 Tenn. 252, 6 Am. St. Rep. 835, 2 WILGUS CORP. CASES, 1695. Also holding *bona fide* purchaser, without notice that the stock is not fully paid, not liable for the unpaid subscription price are *Erskine v. Loewenstein*, 82 Mo. 301; *Wintringham v. Rosenthal*, 25 Hun 580.

DAMAGES—MEASURE FOR WRONGFUL LEVY AND DETENTION.—Plaintiff sues on the official bond of a constable to recover the damages suffered by him by reason of the wrongful levy by the constable on and sale of the plaintiff's exempt team, claiming damages to the value of the team plus the value of their use for two and a half years (from the time of the levy). The constable was informed of the claim of exemption before sale and demanded and received an indemnity bond. Defendants objected to proof of plaintiff's inability to buy another team and to proof of the value of the